

**§51.16 Distinction between changes in procedure and changes in substance.**

The failure of the Attorney General to interpose an objection to a procedure for instituting a change affecting voting does not exempt the substantive change from the preclearance requirement. For example, if the procedure for the approval of an annexation is changed from city council approval to approval in a referendum, the preclearance of the new procedure does not exempt an annexation accomplished under the new procedure from the preclearance requirement.

**§51.17 Special elections.**

(a) The conduct of a special election (e.g., an election to fill a vacancy; an initiative, referendum, or recall election; or a bond issue election) is subject to the preclearance requirement to the extent that the jurisdiction makes changes in the practices or procedures to be followed.

(b) Any discretionary setting of the date for a special election or scheduling of events leading up to or following a special election is subject to the preclearance requirement.

(c) A jurisdiction conducting a referendum election to ratify a change in a practice or procedure that affects voting may submit the change to be voted on at the same time that it submits any changes involved in the conduct of the referendum election. A jurisdiction wishing to receive preclearance for the change to be ratified should state clearly that such preclearance is being requested. See §51.22 of this part.

**§51.18 Federal court-ordered changes.**

(a) *In general.* Changes affecting voting for which approval by a Federal court is required, or that are ordered by a Federal court, are exempt from section 5 review only where the Federal court prepared the change and the change has not been subsequently adopted or modified by the relevant governmental body. *McDaniel v. Sanchez*, 452 U.S. 130 (1981). (See also §51.22.)

(b) *Subsequent changes.* Where a Federal court-ordered change is not itself subject to the preclearance require-

ment, subsequent changes necessitated by the court order but decided upon by the jurisdiction remain subject to preclearance. For example, voting precinct and polling changes made necessary by a court-ordered redistricting plan are subject to section 5 review.

(c) *Alteration in section 5 status.* Where a Federal court-ordered change at its inception is not subject to review under section 5, a subsequent action by the submitting authority demonstrating that the change reflects its policy choices (e.g., adoption or ratification of the change, or implementation in a manner not explicitly authorized by the court) will render the change subject to review under section 5 with regard to any future implementation.

(d) *In emergencies.* A Federal court's authorization of the emergency interim use without preclearance of a voting change does not exempt from section 5 review any use of that practice not explicitly authorized by the court.

[Order 3262–2011, 76 FR 21244, Apr. 15, 2011]

**§51.19 Request for notification concerning voting litigation.**

A jurisdiction subject to the preclearance requirements of section 5 that becomes involved in any litigation concerning voting is requested to notify the Chief, Voting Section, Civil Rights Division, at the addresses, telefacsimile number, or email address specified in §51.24. Such notification will not be considered a submission under section 5.

[Order 3262–2011, 76 FR 21244, Apr. 15, 2011]

**Subpart B—Procedures for Submission to the Attorney General**

**§51.20 Form of submissions.**

(a) Submissions may be made in letter or any other written form.

(b) The Attorney General will accept certain machine readable data in the following electronic media: 3.5 inch 1.4 megabyte disk, compact disc read-only memory (CD-ROM) formatted to the ISO-9660/Joliet standard, or digital versatile disc read-only memory (DVD-